

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

28 NOV 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Secretary, Executive Advisory Group

FROM : F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : Identification of Key Operating Officials
for EAG Consideration

1. In response to the request of the Executive Advisory Group on 20 October, I have polled the Deputies with respect to what positions should be designated for EAG consideration of nominees and what procedures should be followed.

2. With respect to the positions, the Deputies have identified selected positions within their own Directorates and I have compiled the attached composite list, which probably should be discussed within the EAG as the Deputies have had no chance to comment upon each other's listing (See attachment).

3. With respect to the procedures, there appears to be agreement that the starting point should be identification of the time interval in which positions are expected to become vacant. This could be done by asking each Deputy to identify for each designated position within his purview whether it is expected to become vacant: (a) within one year; (b) within one to three years; (3) within three to five years; or (4) longer than five years. The EAG may not consider the latter two time intervals realistic and thus may prefer to concentrate on the first two; that is, "within one year" or "within one to three years." If this identification is performed after January, that may eliminate an element of uncertainty that might be associated with any imminent changes of personnel. For each specified position, the responsible Deputy should designate its grade and any special qualifications that a nominee should possess.

4. A second step would be to ask each Deputy to designate two or three successor candidates for each of the designated positions within the Deputy's own area and to indicate how soon he would consider the successor to be qualified to hold the key position, using the same time intervals ("within one year," "one to three," . . .). This list would

then be presented to the entire EAG for a discussion which might surface additional candidates or steps that might be taken to increase the qualifications of candidates. It figures that priority would be attached to those positions that are expected to become vacant soonest.

5. With respect to the DCI area, I have assumed that the DDCI would have influence concerning the appointment of the Head of any Independent Office; therefore, it would be his choice whether to include the Heads of Independent Offices for EAG consideration.

6. After the initial identification of: (a) positions; (b) how soon they may become vacant; and (c) likely successors, the EAG may wish to establish a procedure wherein the appropriate Deputy is responsible for notifying the EAG as soon as word is received that one of the designated positions is expected to be vacated. He should make his recommendation of the successor with additional inputs being made from the EAG members. Ideally, the successor would already have been earmarked in previous succession planning within the EAG, but the more difficult situation could arise from an unexpected departure of a key official opening a position for which succession planning is incomplete. Where there is not agreement on the successor, the DDCI may have to intervene.

7. Provision should be made for annual revision of the succession plan. It would be helpful if this could be geared to the PDP (Personnel Development Program) cycle.

8. The list of positions for EAG review should not be inflexible but should be modified by the EAG as it finds necessary. It could be lengthened or shortened.

F. W. M. JANNEY

F. W. M. Janney

Attachment